

III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 19, 21, 28, and 30 have been amended. As such, claims 1-32 remain pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly claiming unpatentable subject matter. Further, claims 1-4, 7-9, 14-15, 21-24, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling (US Pat. No. 6,240,411), hereinafter “Thearling” in view of Van Huben et al. (US Pat. No. 6,094,654), hereinafter “Van Huben.” Further, claims 5, 10, 18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Van Huben and in further view of Mani et al. (US Pat. No. 6,677,963), hereinafter “Mani.” Even further, claims 6, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Van Huben and in further view of Miller et al. (US Pat. No. 6,553,366), hereinafter “Miller.” Further, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Van Huben and in further view of King Jr. et al. (US Pub No. 2002/0042731), hereinafter “King.” The Office also rejects claims 11-12, 19, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Andersh et al. (US Pat. No. 7,117,480), hereinafter “Andersh.” Further, claims 13, 20, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Andersh and in further view of Mani et al. (US Pat. No. 6,677,963), hereinafter “Mani” and in further view of Hofman et al. (US Pat. No. 6,687,696), hereinafter “Hofman.” The Office also rejects claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14,15, 19, 21-24, and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Miller. Even further, claims 5, 10, 13, 18, 20, 25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Miller and in further view of Mani and Hofman. Further, claims 6, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Miller and in further view of Miller et al. (US Pat. No. 6,553,366), hereinafter “Miller66.” Finally, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thearling in view of Miller and in further view of King. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following remarks.

A. Rejection of Claims 1-32 Under 35 U.S.C. 101

With regard to claim rejections based upon allegedly non-statutory subject matter, Applicants respectfully traverse. The Office states that “Claims 1-32 recite a ‘method or a system or a product’. However, the claims fail to produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result so as to realize their functionality.” (Office Action at p. 3). Applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, the claims are in condition for allowance and are sufficiently drawn to statutory subject matter. The term, “outputting a result” has been added to the independent claims to illustrate the tangible result caused by execution of the claimed invention. This tangible result is caused by the “method”, “system”, and

“product” embodied in the claimed invention. As such, the tangible result caused by the claimed invention is part of a process, and falls under the purview of 35 U.S.C. 101. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection and allow the claim.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

With respect to claim 1, the Office posits that Thearling discloses, “wherein the customized data mining models are iteratively generated...” (Claim 1). In contrast, Thearling discloses, “... storing whatever parameters are necessary to regenerate and run the model against one or more records in the database...” (Col. 8, lines 26-28)(emphasis added). Thearling does not disclose, *inter alia*, repetitively generating data mining models simultaneously based on permutations in a selected input. More specifically, Thearling does not disclose a system capable of repetitively generating distinct models based upon different data inputs. Where Thearling discloses, “...regenerate and run the model...” it necessarily does not disclose generating distinct models. (Thearling at col. 8, line 27)(emphasis added). As such, Thearling contemplates a different system from that of the claimed invention. Therefore, Thearling does not teach, “wherein the customized data mining models are iteratively generated simultaneously ...” (Claim 1). Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to claims 11, 19, and 30, these claims have been amended to include “...wherein the existing data mining models have been iteratively generated in parallel...” Therefore, the above arguments with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated with respect to claims 11, 19, and 30.

With respect to independent claims 8, 14, 21, and 28, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments made above with respect to claim 1. Further, no combination of prior art cited by the Office is able to overcome the deficiencies of Thearling. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.


IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Date: June 21, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

(MBP)